



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/393,724	09/10/1999	W. K. MEADE II	10990944-1	3204

22879 7590 07/26/2002

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

TRAN, DOUGLAS Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/393,724

Applicant(s)

MEADE ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas Q. Tran

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/10/99 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davidson, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 6,025,925).

As to claim 1, Davidson teaches an apparatus (i.e., either host 32 or 14 in fig. 1) for tracking usage information for an image forming device (i.e., printer 13 in fig. 1), comprising:

An image-forming device (i.e., laser printer 13 in fig. 1);

Processing circuitry (i.e., NPAP circuitry 100 including NPAP response 137 in fig. 3) associated with the image forming device and operative to detect consumable usage information at the image forming device (NPAP response 137 detects status message from emulation manager 132, col. 10, lines 32-35); and

Memory coupled with the processing circuitry (NPAP 137 coupled with emulations manager 132 in fig. 3 in which emulations has a memory for storing job accounting information, col. 10, lines 15-17 and col. 17, lines 24-25) and operative to store a data file (i.e., job accounting information message, col. 10, lines 14-17) containing the user information, the output job information, and the usage information (the job accounting information including the

Art Unit: 2624

network user's name, a job identifier number, and the usage information such as job processing time or number of sheets of paper used by each paper source, col. 4, lines 38-46).

As to claim 2, Davidson teaches the data file comprising cost accounting information of consumables utilized by the image forming device when generating output jobs (note: job accounting information is report based on the print job completed at the print engine, see fig. 3, col. 10, lines 32-35).

As to claim 3, Davidson teaches that information of consumables comprises paper usage (col. 4, lines 42-43) and the output job comprises a print job (col. 4, lines 22-24).

As to claim 5, Davidson teaches that the usage information of the data file includes data packets (374 in fig. 5C) containing consumable usage information (see table #1 in col. 12 and lines 37-39).

As to claim 6, Davidson teaches that a local area network (15 in fig. 1) and a client computer (14 in fig. 1), wherein the client computer and the image forming device (13 in fig. 1) each communicate with the LAN (fig. 1).

As to claim 7, Davidson teaches that a domain controller (NPAP Task 100 in fig. 3), wherein a user submits a print job to the image forming device from the client computer, and wherein the domain controller verifies identification of the user (NPAP recognizes the user ID in order to report the status of the printer, col. 8, lines 30-35).

As to claim 8, Davidson teaches that the image-forming device includes a user interface (i.e., operator panel), and wherein a walk up user (i.e., operator) submits a copy job to the image-forming device via the user interface (col. 10, lines 1-3 and col. 7, lines 35-37).

As to claim 9, Davidson teaches that the user interface includes a reader operative to identify the walk up user (col. 10, lines 1-3).

As to claim 10, Davidson teaches a hard copy output device (13 in fig. 1) usable with LAN (15 in fig. 1) and a client computer (14 in fig. 1), comprising:

Processing circuitry (i.e., NPAP circuitry 100 including NPAP response 137 in fig. 3) associated with the hard copy output device (13 in fig. 1) and operative to receive LAN data packets from the client computer over the LAN (216 in fig. 4A, col. 6, lines 61-62) that identifies a user and a print job (col. 2, lines 58-59); and

Memory coupled with the processing circuitry (NPAP 137 coupled with emulations manager 132 in fig. 3 in which emulations has a memory for storing job accounting information, col. 10, lines 15-17 and col. 17, lines 24-25) and operative to store a data file containing the LAN data packets and consumable usage information (the job accounting information including the network user's name, a job identifier number, and the usage information such as job processing time or number of sheets of paper used by each paper source, col. 4, lines 38-46).

As to claim 12, Davidson teaches that comprises a user interface configured to enable a user to input a user identification (col. 2, lines 57-58).

As to claim 13, Davidson teaches that cost information is collected at the hard copy output device on a print job by print job basis (note: accounting information is generated at a printer after each print job is done, see fig. 3, col. 10, lines 32-35).

As to claim 14, Davidson teaches that the hard copy output device increments page counts to obtain cost information (the job accounting information including number of sheets of

Art Unit: 2624

paper used by each paper source, the purpose of the page counting for accounting or cost, col. 4, lines 42-43).

As to claim 15, Davidson teaches that an LDAP server (16 or 32 in fig. 1) and a LAN (15 in fig. 1), wherein the LDAP server maintains user information and is operative to implement consumable cost recovery (col. 6, lines 43-50).

As to claim 16, Davidson teaches:

Collecting data identifying a user and a print job (col. 9, lines 48-51 and col. 2, lines 57-59);

Storing the data in a memory of the image-forming device (col. 17, lines 24-25);

Generating a print job with the image-forming device (from 122 in fig. 3);

Determining consumable usage data at the image forming device (in step of 320 in fig. 5A); and

Storing the consumable usage data in the memory of the image-forming device (col. 10, lines 14-16 and col. 17, lines 24-25).

As to claim 18, Davidson teaches that the data identifying a user and a print job comprises packet data (col. 6, lines 61-62 and col. 11, lines 11-12).

As to claim 19, Davidson teaches that collecting packet data is carried out at a client personal computer (14 in fig. 1, col. 6, lines 61-62).

As to claim 20, Davidson teaches that generating a print job comprises requesting a print job from a client computer and forwarding the request over a LAN (15 in fig. 1) to the image-forming device (col. 3, lines 11-14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidson as applied to claims 1, 10 and 16 above, in view of Motamed (US Patent No. 6,356,359).

As to claim 4, Davidson teaches every feature in claim 1.

However, Davidson does not explicitly teach the status of usage toner is provided to the user.

Motamed, in the same field of endeavor, teaches the information of toner usage in the printer (26 in fig. 5) is provided to a client (72 or 92 in fig. 10) via a network (col. 5, lines 27-38).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the emulations manager of the printer 132 in Davidson for accounting and providing the usage toner of the printer to the client as taught by Motamed. The suggestion for modifying the emulations manager 132 of the printer in Davidson can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Motamed because 1) both of Davidson and Motamed are the same field of the collected status of the print job in the printer; and 2) Motamed teaches a toner usage estimation system to determine the cost of consumable materials for printed documents and provides these information to the client via network. Therefore, the

Art Unit: 2624

clients in the computers can keep track the actual cost per printed page that can vary significantly for different print jobs.

As to claim 11, Davidson teaches every feature in claim 10.

However, Davidson does not explicitly teach the status of usage toner is provided to the user.

Motamed, in the same field of endeavor, teaches the information of toner usage in the printer (26 in fig. 5) is provided to a client (72 or 92 in fig. 10) via a network (col. 5, lines 27-38).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the emulations manager of the printer 132 in Davidson for accounting and providing the usage toner of the printer to the client as taught by Motamed. The suggestion for modifying the emulations manager 132 of the printer in Davidson can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Motamed because 1) both of Davidson and Motamed are the same field of the collected status of the print job in the printer; and 2) Motamed teaches a toner usage estimation system to determine the cost of consumable materials for printed documents and provides these information to the client via network. Therefore, the clients in the computers can keep track the actual cost per printed page that can vary significantly for different print jobs.

As to claim 17, Davidson teaches every feature in claim 16.

However, Davidson does not explicitly teach the status of usage toner is provided to the user.

Art Unit: 2624

Motamed, in the same field of endeavor, teaches the information of toner usage in the printer (26 in fig. 5) is provided to a client (72 or 92 in fig. 10) via a network (col. 5, lines 27-38).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the emulations manager of the printer 132 in Davidson for accounting and providing the usage toner of the printer to the client as taught by Motamed. The suggestion for modifying the emulations manager 132 of the printer in Davidson can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Motamed because 1) both of Davidson and Motamed are the same field of the collected status of the print job in the printer; and 2) Motamed teaches a toner usage estimation system to determine the cost of consumable materials for printed documents and provides these information to the client via network. Therefore, the clients in the computers can keep track the actual cost per printed page that can vary significantly for different print jobs.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas Q. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4857 or E-mail address is Douglas.tran@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Douglas Q. Tran
July 27, 2002



DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600